



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

roh

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,520	08/03/2001	Donald Pham	CISCO-4113	8849

7590 12/13/2005
Timothy A. Brisson
Sierra Patent Group
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449

EXAMINER

DUONG, DUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2663	

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,520

Applicant(s)

PHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Duc T. Duong

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7,11-13,17-21 and 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7,11-13,17-21 and 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The indicated allowability of claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, 17-21 and 25-30 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s), the rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bournas (US Patent 6,201,791 B1).

Regarding to claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, Bournas discloses an apparatus for measuring the performance of a scalable network (fig. 1) comprising means 112 for preparing the network for testing (fig. 5 col. 6 lines 3-10); means for establishing an IP routing path 102/106 for a session to be tested (fig. 1 col. 3 lines 38-49); means 114 for sending a constant stream of packets to a client node 108 (fig. 5 col. 6 lines 13-15; noted the N packets are sent in a loop in an immediate succession, and thus the packets are sent in constant stream); and means 116 for counting said received packets (fig. 5 and 8 col. 6 lines 15-26); and establishing a peak performance rate (optimal window size) as the highest rate with no packet dropout (fig. 6 col. 7 lines 41-46; noted

Art Unit: 2663

the optimal window size (rate) is calculated once all ACKs for test packets are received, and thus the optimal window size is calculated with no packet loss).

Bournas fails to teach explicitly the routing path is a static IP route.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to arrange the IP routing path 102/106 in Bournas as static since such arrangement is a matter of choice that would serve the same purpose, and thus constitutes no new inventive concept.

Regarding to claim 29, Bournas discloses the packet generator 14 is configured to perform testing using software 116 (fig. 1 col. 3 lines 61-64).

4. Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bournas in view of Beverly, IV (U.S. Patent 6,732,182 B1).

Regarding to claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25-28, Bournas discloses all the limitations with respect to claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 except for the constant stream of packets are sent over an OC-3 or OC-12 level networks. However, Beverly discloses a system for generating a packet loss report, wherein test packets are sends over an OC-3 or OC-12 level (col. 4 lines 21-26) via Ethernet pathways 224-228 (fig. 2 col. 6 lines 16-20). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ a transmission of test packets over OC-3 and OC-12 network via Ethernet pathways as taught by Beverly in Bournas's system for measuring the performance of high speed networks, such as SONET or SDH.

Art Unit: 2663

5. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bournas in view of Dawson (US Patent 6625,764 B1).

Regarding to claim 30, Bournas discloses all the limitations with respect to claim 19, except for a test configuration file is download from a TFTP server. However, Dawson discloses a system under testing using a download CRC calculation from a TFTP server 30 (fig. 1 col. 5 lines 6-17). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ a CRC calculation value download from a server as taught by Dawson in Bournas's system ensure the system under test functions properly.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Duong whose telephone number is 571-272-3122. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00 AM-5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Q. Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DD


RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER